

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS
RENDERED BY THE INTER-
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 11. Part 12. Pp. 173—182

OPINION 362

Rejection for nomenclatorial purposes of Geoffroy (E.L.),
1767, *Traité Sommaire des Coquilles, tant fluviatiles que
terrestres, qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*



LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7
1955

Price Five Shillings

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THE RULING GIVEN IN OPINION 362

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*).

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953).

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953).

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948).

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology.*)

Professor H. BOSCHMA (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947).

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948).

Dr. Henning LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950).

Professor Pierre BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950).

Mr. Norman Denbigh RILEY (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th June 1950).

Professor Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950).

Professor Robert MERTENS (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950).

Professor Erich Martin HERING (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950).

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953).

Professor J. Chester BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*).

Professor Harold E. VOKES (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953).

Professor Béla HANKÓ (*Mezőgazdasági Múzeum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953).

Mr. P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953).

Dr. L. B. HOLTHUIS (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953).

OPINION 362

REJECTION FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES OF GEOFFROY (E.L.), 1767, "TRAITÉ SOMMAIRE DES COQUILLES, TANT FLUVIATILES QUE TERRESTRES, QUI SE TROUVENT AUX ENVIRONS DE PARIS"

RULING :—(1) In the work entitled *Traité Sommaire des Coquilles, tant fluviatiles que terrestres, qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* published in 1767, Geoffroy (E.L.) did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, and accordingly no name acquired the status of availability under the Law of Priority in virtue of having been so published.

(2) The title of the foregoing work is hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* as Title No. 30.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In June 1951 Dr. Bengt Hubendick (*Zoologiska Institutionen Uppsala, Sweden*) submitted to the Commission an application for the use of its Plenary Powers for the purpose, mainly, of designating for the genus *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (Class Gastropoda) a type species in harmony with the accustomed usage¹. In this application Dr. Hubendick drew attention to

¹ For the decision by the Commission on Dr. Hubendick's application regarding the name *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774, see *Opinion* 363.

the fact that the name *Ancylus* had been published by Geoffroy (E.L.) in 1767 in a work entitled *Traité Sommaire des Coquilles, tant fluviatiles que terrestres, qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* which, however, he considered was not available nomenclatorially, because in it Geoffroy had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948. In the concluding paragraph of his application Dr. Hubendick, when summarising his recommendations, included a request that the Commission should give a Ruling that for the foregoing reason Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire* was not a nomenclatorially available work. The following are extracts of the portions of Dr. Hubendick's application regarding the name *Ancylus* Müller in which he discussed Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire* (paragraphs 2 and 3) and submitted to the Commission the recommendation indicated above (paragraph 8(1)) :—

Extracts from Dr. Bengt Hubendick's application regarding the generic name "Ancylus" Müller (O.F.), 1774, of the portions relating to the status of the work by Geoffroy (E.L.) entitled "Traité Sommaire des Coquilles qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris" published in 1767

(A) Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Dr. Hubendick's application :

2. The generic name *Ancylus* was first published in 1767 by Geoffroy on pages 13 and 124 of his *Traité sommaire des Coquilles . . . qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*. Geoffroy placed what he regarded as one species only in this genus but he did not cite it under a binominal name. The description which he gave is so vague that the species which he had in mind might have been either the species now commonly treated as having already been named *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 783) or the later named species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (*Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 201). Geoffroy stated, however, that the species in question was the only one known in the neighbourhood of Paris and this suggests that this species was the common *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller. This inference is supported by the fact that Geoffroy cited (1) Lister (1678, *Hist. Anim. Angl.* : 151, pl. 2, fig. 32), (2) Gualtieri (1742, *Index Test. Conch.* : pl. 2, fig. AA), and (3) d'Argenville (1780, *Conch.* **2** : 1, pls. 8, 27), for the figures given by all of these authors appear to represent the foregoing species. On the other hand, Geoffroy cited also the description of

Patella lacustris published by Linnaeus in 1746 (*Faun. svec.* (ed. 1) : 369) and again in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 783). There has, however, been discussion in the past as to the identity of the species to which Linnaeus applied this name. Jeffreys (1862, *Brit. Conch.* 1 : 123), for example, and Woodward (B.B.) (1903, *J. Conch.* 10 : 361) pointed out that the description given by Linnaeus applied as well to the species *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller as to that to which the name *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus, 1758, is commonly applied; the figures cited by Linnaeus appear to depict *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, and that species alone is represented in the Linnean collection. It was for reasons of this order that nearly one hundred years ago Forbes & Hanley (1852, *Hist. Brit. Moll.* 4 : 188) and Hanley (1855, *Ipsa Linnaei Conchylia* : 426) applied the trivial name *lacustris* Linnaeus to the species named *fluviatilis* by Müller. In recent times other authors including Kennard & Woodward (1920, *J. linn. Soc. Lond.* (Zool.) 34 : 210) have taken the opposite view, holding either that the species which Müller identified as *Ancylus lacustris* (Linnaeus) was in fact the species to which Linnaeus in 1758 had given the name *Patella lacustris* or that, notwithstanding the dissimilarity of that species from *Ancylus fluviatilis*, Linnaeus had confused the two species together and therefore that his nominal species *Patella lacustris* was a composite species. It may, therefore, be the case that Geoffroy had in mind only one species, namely *Ancylus fluviatilis* Müller, when in 1767, he used the generic name *Ancylus*. As we shall see, however, the name *Ancylus*, as used by Geoffroy, is an invalid name. The sense in which he applied it has, therefore, no nomenclatorial significance, being of historical interest only. As to the trivial name *lacustris* Linnaeus, there is no doubt that Müller (1774) applied it to the first of the two species which may have been comprised in it by Linnaeus, for to the second of those species he then gave the name *Ancylus fluviatilis*. It is in accordance with the interpretation of Müller that the name *lacustris* Linnaeus is now generally used and it is in this sense that the nominal species *Patella lacustris* Linnaeus is today accepted as the type species of *Acroloxus* Beck, 1837.

3. There have in the past been differences of opinion among specialists on the question whether in his *Traité sommaire* of 1767 Geoffroy applied the principles of "nomenclature binaire" (as prescribed, up to 1948, by Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*) and therefore as to whether new names published by Geoffroy in the foregoing work acquired thereby any rights under the Law of Priority. Fortunately, all scope for further argument regarding the meaning to be attached to the above Proviso to Article 25 was put an end to in Paris in 1948 when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission, (1) gave a ruling that the expression "nomenclature binaire" as hitherto used in the *Règles*, had a meaning identical with that attaching to the expression "nomenclature binominale", and (2) decided to substitute

the latter entirely unambiguous expression for the expression "nomenclature binaire", wherever that expression had formerly appeared in the *Règles* (1905, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 63—66). During the same session the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided that, in accordance with the foregoing decision, another work by Etienne Louis Geoffroy [1727—1810], his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, failed to comply with the requirements of Proviso (b) to Article 25, by reason of the fact that in that work Geoffroy had not "appliqué les principes de la nomenclature binominale" (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 366—369). The system of nomenclature in the *Traité sommaire* is identical with that used both earlier (in 1762) and later (in 1799—1800) in the two editions of the *Histoire abrégée*. It follows, therefore, that under the decisions cited above new names in the *Traité sommaire* possess no rights under the Law of Priority in virtue of having been so published. In order, however, to put a stop to the risk of further discussion on this subject, it would be convenient if the International Commission were now to give a formal ruling to the foregoing effect, so that the *Traité sommaire* may be added to the list of works rejected for non-compliance with Proviso (b) to Article 25.

(B) Paragraph 8(1) of Dr. Hubendick's application :

. . . The Commission should :—

- (1) give a ruling that in the work entitled *Traité sommaire des Coquilles . . . qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, published in 1767 (as in the *Historie abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, published in 1762 and republished in 1799—1800) Geoffroy (E.L.) did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as amended by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, and therefore that no name acquired availability under the Law of Priority in virtue of being so published ;

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

2. Registration of the present application : At the time of the receipt of Dr. Hubendick's application it was considered that it

would be convenient during the initial stages to treat his proposals relating to the status to be accorded to Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire* and those relating to the generic name *Ancylus* Müller (O.F.), 1774, as constituting a single application. This twofold application was allotted the Registered Number Z.N.(S.) 240.

3. Publication of the present application : Dr. Hubendick's application was sent to the printer on 13th May 1951 for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* but owing to various circumstances it was not actually published until 23rd May 1952 (Hubendick, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 227—230). Of the portions of the foregoing application which was concerned with the status of Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire* the passage reproduced in Section (A) of paragraph 1 of the present *Opinion* appeared on pages 227—228, and that reproduced in Section (B), appearing at the foot of page 229 and the top of page 230.

4. No objection received: By reason of the proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of designating a type species for the genus *Ancylus* Müller, 1774, Public Notice was given of Dr. Hubendick's application in the prescribed manner. No objection was, however, elicited as regards the portion of that application which was concerned with Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire*.

5. Preparation of a Report for consideration by the Commission on the procedure proposed to be adopted in the present case : On 15th March 1954 Mr. Hemming, as Secretary, prepared for the consideration of the Commission the following brief Report on the origin and nature of the present application and the procedure proposed to be adopted in dealing with it :—

Origin of application : The present application arose incidentally in an application on the name *Ancylus* (see V.P.(54)31). In view of its general character, it has been thought better to treat the subject separately and to render a separate *Opinion* on it. The issue involved is accordingly submitted in a separate Voting Paper.

Nature of application : The present application relates to a work (the *Traité Sommaire*) published in 1767 by an author (E. L. Geoffroy) who never adopted the binominal nomenclature of Linnaeus. One

work by this author (*Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris*) has already been rejected as being non-binominal (*Bull.* 4 : 368), a decision recently embodied in *Opinion* 228 (now in the press).

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature. In view of the decision by the Copenhagen Congress to establish the foregoing *Official Index* (1953, *Cop. Dec. zool. Nomencl.* : 23), a proposal to add the title of Geoffroy's *Traité Sommaire* to this *Index* has been added to Dr. Hubendick's proposal in the recommendation now submitted.

III.—THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

6. Issue of Voting Paper V.P.(54)30 : On 17th March 1954, a Voting Paper (V.P.(54)30) was issued in which Members of the Commission were invited to vote either for, or against, "the proposal relating to Geoffroy, 1767, *Traité Sommaire* as set out at the foot of the present Voting Paper". The proposal set out at the foot of the foregoing Voting Paper was in terms identical with the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*.

7. The Prescribed Voting Period : As the foregoing Voting Paper was issued under the Three-Month Rule, the Prescribed Voting Period closed on 17th June, 1954.

8. Particulars of the Voting on Voting Paper V.P.(54)30 : At the close of the Prescribed Voting Period, the state of the voting on Voting Paper V.P.(54)30 was as follows :—

- (a) *Affirmative Votes had been given by the following nineteen (19) Commissioners (arranged in the order in which Votes were received) :*

Riley ; Holthuis ; Vokes ; Hering ; Bonnet ; Boschma ;

Lemche ; Dymond ; do Amaral ; Sylvester-Bradley ; Esaki ; Mertens ; Hemming ; Jaczewski ; Bradley (J.C.) ; Hankó ; Pearson ; Stoll ; Cabrera ;

(b) *Negative Votes :*

None ;

(c) *Voting Papers not returned :*

None.

9. Declaration of Result of Vote : On 18th June 1954 Mr. Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission, acting as Returning Officer for the Vote taken on Voting Paper V.P.(54)30, signed a Certificate that the Votes cast were as set out in paragraph 8 above and declaring that the proposal submitted in the foregoing Voting Paper had been duly adopted and that the decision so taken was the decision of the International Commission in the matter aforesaid.

10. Preparation of the Ruling given in the present " Opinion " : On 22nd February 1955 Mr. Hemming prepared the Ruling given in the present *Opinion* and at the same time signed a Certificate that the terms of that Ruling were in complete accord with those of the proposal approved by the International Commission in its Vote on Voting Paper V.P.(54)30.

11. The prescribed procedures were duly complied with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in dealing with the present case, and the present *Opinion* is accordingly hereby rendered in the name of the said International Commission by the under-signed Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon him in that behalf.

12. The present *Opinion* shall be known as *Opinion* Three Hundred and Sixty-Two (362) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DONE in London, this Twenty-Second day of February, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Five.

*Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature*

FRANCIS HEMMING